

REMARKS

The present application amends claims 1, 6-8, 11, 12, 24, and 30-34, leaves claims 2-5, 9, 10, 13-23, and 25-29 unchanged, and adds claims 35-43. Therefore, the present application has pending claims 1-43.

Claim Objections

The Examiner objected to claims 6, 7 and 24, citing informalities. The claims have been amended, where appropriate, to overcome these objections. Therefore, these objections should be withdrawn.

35 U.S.C. §102 Rejections

Claims 1-14, 18, 22, and 24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,571,251 to Koski, et al. ("Koski"). This rejection is traversed for the following reasons. Applicants submit that the features of the present invention, as now more clearly recited in claims 1-14, 18, 22, and 24, are not taught or suggested by Koski, whether taken individually or in combination with any of the other references of record. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw this rejection.

Amendments were made to the claims to more clearly describe features of the present invention. Specifically, amendments were made to the claims to more clearly describe that the present invention is directed to a method of generating information on new solutions, an information service providing system, a recording medium, and a method of generating information at an engineering an engineering portal site as recited, for example, in independent claims 1, 8, 11, 12, and 34.

The present invention, as recited in claim 1 and as similarly recited in claims, 8, 11, 12, and 34, provides a method for generating information on new solutions for solving problems. The method includes a step of receiving an instruction that includes information regarding a database to be searched relating to a problem input by a user for searching a meta database. Another step includes judging whether or not the meta database is to be searched in accordance with the information relating to the database to be searched. The method also includes searching for a rule to solve the problem. The meta database is searched, if it is determined that the meta database is to be searched, and the case database is searched, if it is determined that the meta database is not to be searched. The meta database includes a plurality of rules extracted from a plurality of actual examples regarding new solutions, each of the rules being either a physical or chemical rule indexed by both an improving physical or chemical parameter, and a deteriorating physical or chemical parameter. The case database contains new solutions to solve the problems. Each example includes an instrument having a predetermined function according to the plurality of rules to determine information regarding a relationship between one of the solutions and one of the problems to be solved to generate data regarding the examples of new solutions. Another step includes displaying on the display the data regarding the examples of new solutions to solve the problem with corresponding instruments and with corresponding rules in the plurality of rules in the meta database. The prior art does not disclose all these features.

The above described features of the present invention, as now more clearly recited in the claims, are not taught or suggested by any of the references of record, particularly Koski, whether taken individually or in combination with any of the other references of record.

Koski discloses a case-based reasoning system and method having a search engine that compares input tokens with view tokens for matching cases within a view. However, there is no teaching or suggestion in Koski of a method of generating information on new solutions, an information service providing system, a recording medium, and a method of generating information at an engineering an engineering portal site as recited in the claims.

Koski provides a case-based reasoning system that includes a case database capable of storing a plurality of cases that each include one or more attributes. A view generator in the case-based reasoning system generates a view of the case database by representing each case within at least a selected subset of the plurality of cases within the case database with one or more uniform-length view tokens. An input parser in the case-based reasoning system provides a tokenized representation of an input incident that includes one or more input tokens. The case-based reasoning system further includes a search engine that compares the input tokens with the view tokens to identify one or more closely matching cases within the view. By searching the view rather than directly searching the case database, cases that closely match the input are efficiently identified.

One feature of the present invention, as recited in claim 1 and as similarly recited in claims 8, 11, 12, and 34, includes determining whether or not a meta database is to be searched in accordance with information regarding the database to be searched. Koski does not disclose this feature. As shown in Fig. 1, Koski discloses a case base 12 and a view storage 16. Column 2, lines 57-59 describes the case base 12 as a database for storing attributes of experiences called cases. Further described in column 3, lines 43-46 is the view storage 16. A view generator 14 generates compact views of the contents of case base 12 and stores the views in view storage 16. The views produced by view generator 14 can be searched much more efficiently than case base 12, permitting rapid identification of one or more cases in case base 12. Unlike in the present invention, Koski does not disclose where a determination is made as to whether or not a meta database, as claimed, is to be searched in accordance with information received regarding the database to be searched. For example, column 3, lines 54-66 of Koski merely describes where a user enters a description of an incident, which is then parsed and passed to a search engine. The parsed input is then used to select a particular view from view storage 16, which is then passed on to the search engine. The search engine searches the selected view to identify the case or cases that best match the incident. As such, Koski discloses where the view storage 16 is automatically chosen to be searched, as a matter of efficiency (see also, the last line of the Abstract). In this way, Koski does not disclose determining whether or not a meta database is to be searched in accordance with information on the database to be searched.

Another feature of the present invention, as recited in claim 1 and as similarly recited in claims 8, 11, 12, and 30, includes searching for a rule for solving the problem in response to an input instruction. As shown in Fig. 6 of the present application, the meta database is searched, if it is determined that the meta database is to be searched. In addition, the case database is searched, if it is determined that the meta database is not to be searched. Koski does not disclose this feature. As previously discussed, Koski does not disclose where a determination is made regarding whether to search a meta database, as claimed. Therefore, it follows that Koski does not disclose where a meta database is searched, if it is determined that the meta database is to be searched, and where a case database is searched, if it is determined that the meta database is not to be searched.

Therefore, Koski fails to teach or suggest “determining whether or not the meta database is to be searched in accordance with the information on the database to be searched” as recited in claim 1, and as similarly recited in claims 8, 11, 12, and 34.

Furthermore, Koski fails to teach or suggest “searching said meta database, if it is determined that the meta database is to be searched, or searching said case database, if it determined that the meta database is not to be searched, for a rule for solving the problem in response to the instruction input, the meta database including a plurality of rules extracted from a plurality of actual examples regarding new solutions for any of the problems, each of the rules being a physical or chemical rule

having been indexed by both an improving physical or chemical parameter and a deteriorating physical or chemical parameter in advance, the case database containing the new solutions to solve the problems, each example including an instrument having a predetermined function according to the plurality of rules to determine information on a relationship between one of the solutions and one of the problems to be solved thereby to generate data regarding the examples of new solutions” as recited in claim 1, and as similarly recited in claims 8, 11, 12, and 34.

Therefore, Koski fails to teach or suggest the features of the present invention, as now more clearly recited in the claims. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §102(e) rejection of claims 1-14, 18, 22, and 34 are respectfully requested:

The remaining references of record have been studied. Applicants submit that they do not supply any of the deficiencies noted above with respect to the references used in the rejection of claims 1-14, 18, 22, and 34.

35 U.S.C. §103 Rejections

Claims 15, 19, 23, 27, and 30

Claims 15, 19, 23, 27, and 30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Koski in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,772,103 to King. Claims 15, 19, 23, and 27, are dependent on claims 1, 8, 11, and 12. Therefore, claims 15, 19, 23, and 27 are allowable for at least the reasons previously discussed regarding independent claims 1, 8, 11, and 12. This rejection with regard to claim 30 is traversed for the following reasons. Applicants submit that the features of the

present invention, as now more clearly recited in claim 30, are not taught or suggested by either Koski or King, whether taken individually or in combination with each other in the manner suggested by the Examiner. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw this rejection.

Amendments were made to the claims to more clearly describe features of the present invention. Specifically, amendments were made to the claims to more clearly describe that the present invention is directed to a method for generating information on solutions for solving problems as recited, for example, in independent claim 30.

The present invention, as recited in claim 30, includes provides a method for generating information on solutions for solving problems, the generated information being output to a display at a site server. The method includes determining whether or not a meta database is to be searched in accordance with information on a database to be searched. The method also includes searching for a rule for solving a problem either a meta database or a case database, in response to an instruction including the information on the database to be searched. If it is determined that the meta database is to be searched, then the meta database is searched. If it is determined that the meta database is not to be searched, then case database is searched. The meta database includes a plurality of rules extracted from a plurality of actual examples regarding new solutions to solve problems, each of the rules being a physical or chemical rule having been indexed by both an improving physical or chemical parameter and a deteriorating physical or chemical parameter in

advance. Each of the examples includes an analytical instrument to generate a relationship between each solution and each problem to be solved. The instruction is related to a combination of a state selection, a part selection and an analysis condition of selection, and a corresponding solution including a combination of an analytical technique and the analytical instrument. The method also includes displaying data on the display at the site server regarding examples of new solutions to solve the problems input by the user along with a corresponding instrument, based on a search result and with corresponding rules in the plurality of rules in the meta database, history of input instructions, and a plurality of instruments in the solutions with their priority levels in an order of degree of difficulty in destroying a sample to be analyzed when a morphologic observation is selected as the analysis selection. The prior art does not disclose all these features.

The above described features of the present invention, as now more clearly recited in the claims, are not taught or suggested by any of the references of record. Specifically, the features are not taught or suggested by either Koski or King, whether taken individually or in combination with each other.

As previously discussed, Koski discloses a case-based reasoning system and method having a search engine that compares input tokens with view tokens for matching cases within a view. However, there is no teaching or suggestion in Koski of a method for generating information on solutions for solving problems, as recited in the claims.

One feature of the present invention, as recited in claim 30, includes determining whether or not a meta database is to be searched in accordance with information regarding the database to be searched. Koski does not disclose this feature. As previously discussed, unlike in the present invention, Koski does not disclose where a determination is made as to whether or not a meta database, as claimed, is to be searched in accordance with information received regarding the database to be searched. For example, column 3, lines 54-66 of Koski merely describes where a user enters a description of an incident, which is then parsed and passed to a search engine. The parsed input is then used to select a particular view from view storage 16, which is then passed on to the search engine. The search engine searches the selected view to identify the case or cases that best match the incident. As such, Koski discloses where the view storage 16 is automatically chosen to be searched, as a matter of efficiency (see also, the last line of the Abstract). In this way, Koski does not disclose determining whether or not a meta database is to be searched in accordance with information on the database to be searched.

Another feature of the present invention, as recited in claim 30, includes a step of searching, for a rule for solving a problem, the meta database or a case database. The meta database is searched if it is determined that the meta database is to be searched, and the case database is searched, if it is determined that the meta database is not to be searched. Koski does not disclose this feature. As previously discussed, Koski does not disclose where a determination is made

regarding whether to search a meta database, as claimed. Therefore, it follows that Koski does not disclose where a meta database is searched, if it is determined that the meta database is to be searched, and where a case database is searched, if it is determined that the meta database is not to be searched.

Therefore, Koski fails to teach or suggest “determining whether or not a meta database is to be searched in accordance with information on a database to be searched” as recited in claim 30.

Furthermore, Koski fails to teach or suggest means for searching, at the site server, in response to an instruction including the information on the database to be searched related to the problem input by a user, the meta database, if it is determined the meta database is to be searched, or searching a case database, if it is determined that the meta database is not to be searched, for a rule for solving a problem, the meta database including a plurality of rules extracted from a plurality of actual examples regarding new solutions to solve problems, each of the rules being a physical or chemical rule having been indexed by both an improving physical or chemical parameter and a deteriorating physical or chemical parameter in advance, each of the examples including an analytical instrument to generate a relationship between each solution and each problem to be solved thereby, the instruction being related to a combination of a state selection, a part selection and an analysis condition of selection, and a corresponding solution comprising a combination of an analytical technique and the analytical instrument” as recited in claim 30.

The above noted deficiencies of Koski are not supplied by any of the other references or record, particularly King. Therefore, combining the teachings of King with Koski still fails to teach or suggest the features of the present invention, as now more clearly recited in the claims.

King teaches a method for selecting a parts kit detail. However, there is no teaching or suggestion in King of a method for generating information on solutions for solving problems, as recited in the claims.

In King, a method for selecting a parts kit detail for the installation of a pressure transducer on a container such as a pipeline or a vessel is disclosed, where the container holds a fluid material. A parts kit detail is a drawing or a list of the primary parts needed to install a pressure responsive instrument on a pipe line or on a vessel according to a standardized design applicable to at least one installation category. The method includes a step of establishing at least two different installation categories, each such different installation category being defined by the properties of the fluid material. The method also includes a step of establishing at least two different parts kit details, where each applies to the different installation categories.

King's system, which is in a field entirely different from that of the present invention, is nonanalogous art. As provided in MPEP 2141.01(a), a reference relied upon under 35 U.S.C. §103 must be analogous prior art. Specifically, "the reference must either be in the field of Applicants' endeavor or, if not, then be reasonably pertinent to the particular problem with which the inventor was concerned." *In re*

Oetiker, 977 F.2d 1443, 1446, 24 USPQ2d 1443, 1445 (Fed. Cir. 1992). The U.S. Patent and Trademark Office classified King's method for selecting a parts kit detail under Data Processing: Structural Design, Modeling, Simulation, and Emulation (Class 703). This class has no relationship to the subject matter of the present invention, which has been classified under Data Processing: Database and File Management or Data Structures (Class 707). Therefore, Applicants submit that King is not in the field of Applicants' endeavor. Furthermore, King is not reasonably pertinent to the particular problem with which the inventor was concerned. Therefore, this rejection should be withdrawn.

In addition to being nonanalogous art, King does not supply the deficiencies as previously discussed regarding Koski. Therefore, the combination of Koski and King does not provide the invention, as claimed.

For example, one feature of the present invention, as recited in claim 30, includes determining whether or not a meta database is to be searched in accordance with information regarding the database to be searched. King does not disclose this feature. King is directed merely to a method for selecting a parts kit detail. There is no teaching or suggestion in King of determining whether or not a meta database is to be searched, as in the present invention.

By way of further example, another feature of the present invention, as recited in claim 30, includes a step of searching either the meta database or a case database, for a rule for solving a problem. The meta database is searched if it is determined that the meta database is to be searched, and the case database is

searched, if it is determined that the meta database is not to be searched. King does not disclose this feature. Again, King is directed merely to a method for selecting a parts kit detail. There is no teaching or suggestion in King of searching either the meta database or a case database, for a rule for solving a problem, as in the present invention.

Therefore, King fails to teach or suggest "determining whether or not a meta database is to be searched in accordance with information on a database to be searched" as recited in claim 30.

Furthermore, King fails to teach or suggest means for searching, at the site server, in response to an instruction including the information on the database to be searched related to the problem input by a user, the meta database, if it is determined the meta database is to be searched, or searching a case database, if it is determined that the meta database is not to be searched, for a rule for solving a problem, the meta database including a plurality of rules extracted from a plurality of actual examples regarding new solutions to solve problems, each of the rules being a physical or chemical rule having been indexed by both an improving physical or chemical parameter and a deteriorating physical or chemical parameter in advance, each of the examples including an analytical instrument to generate a relationship between each solution and each problem to be solved thereby, the instruction being related to a combination of a state selection, a part selection and an analysis condition of selection, and a corresponding solution comprising a combination of an analytical technique and the analytical instrument" as recited in claim 30.

Both Koski and King suffer from the same deficiencies relative to the features of the present invention, as recited in claim 30. Therefore, combining the teachings of King with Koski does not render obvious the features of the present invention, as now more clearly recited in claim 30. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection of claims 15, 19, 23, 27, and 30 are respectfully requested.

The remaining references of record have been studied. Applicants submit that they do not supply any of the deficiencies noted above with respect to the references used in the rejection of claims 15, 19, 23, 27, and 30.

Claims 16, 20, 24-26, and 28

Claims 16, 20, 24-26, and 28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Koski in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,647,383 to August. This rejection is traversed for the following reasons. Claims 16, 20, 24-26, and 28 are dependent on claims 1, 8, 11, and 12. Therefore, Applicants submit that claims 16, 20, 24-26, and 28 are patentable for at least the reasons previously discussed regarding independent claims 1, 8, 11, and 12.

Claims 31-33

Claims 31-33 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Koski in view of King, further in view of August. This rejection is traversed for the following reasons. Applicants submit that the features of the present invention, as now more clearly recited in the claims, are not taught or suggested by Koski, King or August, whether taken individually, or in combination with each other in the

manner suggested by the Examiner. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw this rejection.

Amendments were made to the claims to more clearly describe features of the present invention. Specifically, amendments were made to the claims to more clearly describe that the present invention is directed to an information service providing system and a recording medium as recited, for example, in independent claims 31, 32, and 33.

The present invention, as recited in claim 31, and as similarly recited in claims 32 and 33, provides an information service providing system including means for accepting data. The data includes information regarding a database to be searched about a problem from a user who requests an information service. The system also includes means for determining whether or not a meta database is to be searched in accordance with the information on the database to be searched. Also included in the system is a means for searching for a rule for solving the problem in response to an instruction input by the user and in accordance with the information on the database to be searched. The meta database is searched, if it is determined that the meta database is to be searched, and a case database is searched, if it is determined that the meta database is not to be searched. The meta database includes a plurality of rules extracted from a plurality of actual examples regarding a new solution to solve the problem. Each of the rules is a physical or chemical rule indexed by both an improving physical or chemical parameter and a deteriorating physical or chemical parameter in advance. Each of the examples includes an

analytical instrument to determine information on a relationship between the new solution and the problem to be solved. The instruction is related to a combination of state selection, a part selection and an analysis condition of selection, and a corresponding solution including a combination of an analytical technique and the analytical instrument. The system further includes a means for displaying the new solutions to solve the problem, along with corresponding instruments based on a search result and the corresponding rules in the plurality of rules in the meta database, history of input instructions, and a plurality of instruments in the solutions with their priority levels in an order of degree of difficulty in destroying a sample to be analyzed when morphological observation is selected as the analysis selection. The prior art does not disclose all these features.

The above described features of the present invention, as now more clearly recited in the claims, are not taught or suggested by any of the references of record. Specifically, the features are not taught or suggested by Koski, King, or August, whether taken individually or in combination with each other.

As previously discussed, Koski discloses a case-based reasoning system and method having a search engine that compares input tokens with view tokens for matching cases within a view. However, there is no teaching or suggestion in Koski of an information service providing system or a recording medium as recited, for example, in claims 31, 32 and 33.

One feature of the present invention, as recited in claim 31 and as similarly recited in claims 32 and 33, includes a means for determining whether or not a meta

database is to be searched in accordance with information regarding the database to be searched. Koski does not disclose this feature. As previously discussed, unlike in the present invention, Koski does not disclose where a determination is made as to whether or not a meta database, as claimed, is to be searched in accordance with information received regarding the database to be searched. For example, column 3, lines 54-66 of Koski merely describes where a user enters a description of an incident, which is then parsed and passed to a search engine. The parsed input is then used to select a particular view from view storage 16, which is then passed on to the search engine. The search engine searches the selected view to identify the case or cases that best match the incident. As such, Koski discloses where the view storage 16 is automatically chosen to be searched, as a matter of efficiency (see also, the last line of the Abstract). In this way, Koski does not disclose determining whether or not a meta database is to be searched in accordance with information on the database to be searched.

Another feature of the present invention, as recited in claim 30, includes a means for searching, for a rule for solving a problem, the meta database or a case database. The meta database is searched if it is determined that the meta database is to be searched, and the case database is searched, if it is determined that the meta database is not to be searched. Koski does not disclose this feature. As previously discussed, Koski does not disclose where a determination is made regarding whether to search a meta database, as claimed. Therefore, it follows that Koski does not disclose where a meta database is searched, if it is determined that

the meta database is to be searched, and where a case database is searched, if it is determined that the meta database is not to be searched.

Therefore, Koski fails to teach or suggest “means for determining whether or not a meta database is to be searched in accordance with the information on the database to be searched” as recited in claim 31, and as similarly recited in claims 32 and 33.

Furthermore, Koski fails to teach or suggest “means for searching the meta database, if it is determined that the meta database is to be searched, or searching a case database, if it is determined that the meta database is not to be searched, where the meta database and the case database have been provided in a content offer server in advance, for a rule for solving the problem in response to an instruction input by the demander and in accordance with the information on the database to be searched, the meta database including a plurality of rules extracted from a plurality of actual examples regarding a new solution to solve the problem, each of the rules being a physical or chemical rule having been indexed by both an improving physical or chemical parameter and a deteriorating physical or chemical parameter in advance, each of the examples including an analytical instrument to determine an information on a relationship between the new solution and the problem to be solved, the instruction being related to a combination of a state selection, a part selection and an analysis condition of selection, and a corresponding solution comprising a combination of an analytical technique and the

analytical instrument" as recited in claim 31, and as similarly recited in claims 32 and 33.

The above noted deficiencies of Koski are not supplied by any of the other references or record, particularly King. Therefore, combining the teachings of King with Koski still fails to teach or suggest the features of the present invention, as now more clearly recited in the claims.

As previously discussed, King teaches a method for selecting a parts kit detail. However, there is no teaching or suggestion in King of an information service providing system or recording medium, as recited in the claims.

Also, as previously discussed, King's system, which is in a field entirely different from that of the present invention, is nonanalogous art. As such, Applicants submit that King is not in the field of Applicants' endeavor. Furthermore, King is not reasonably pertinent to the particular problem with which the inventor was concerned. Therefore, this rejection should be withdrawn.

In addition to being nonanalogous art, King does not supply the deficiencies as previously discussed regarding Koski. Therefore, the combination of Koski and King does not provide the invention, as claimed.

For example, one feature of the present invention, as recited in claim 31 and as similarly recited in claims 32 and 33, includes a means for determining whether or not a meta database is to be searched in accordance with information regarding the database to be searched. King does not disclose this feature. King is directed merely to a method for selecting a parts kit detail. There is no teaching or

suggestion in King of determining whether or not a meta database is to be searched, as in the present invention.

By way of further example, another feature of the present invention, as recited in claim 31 and as similarly recited in claims 32 and 33, includes a means for searching either the meta database or a case database, for a rule for solving a problem. The meta database is searched if it is determined that the meta database is to be searched, and the case database is searched, if it is determined that the meta database is not to be searched. King does not disclose this feature. Again, King is directed merely to a method for selecting a parts kit detail. There is no teaching or suggestion in King of searching either the meta database or a case database, for a rule for solving a problem, as in the present invention.

Therefore, King fails to teach or suggest "means for determining whether or not a meta database is to be searched in accordance with the information on the database to be searched" as recited in claim 31, and as similarly recited in claims 32 and 33.

Furthermore, King fails to teach or suggest "means for searching the meta database, if it is determined that the meta database is to be searched, or searching a case database, if it is determined that the meta database is not to be searched, where the meta database and the case database have been provided in a content offer server in advance, for a rule for solving the problem in response to an instruction input by the demander and in accordance with the information on the database to be searched, the meta database including a plurality of rules extracted

from a plurality of actual examples regarding a new solution to solve the problem, each of the rules being a physical or chemical rule having been indexed by both an improving physical or chemical parameter and a deteriorating physical or chemical parameter in advance, each of the examples including an analytical instrument to determine an information on a relationship between the new solution and the problem to be solved, the instruction being related to a combination of a state selection, a part selection and an analysis condition of selection, and a corresponding solution comprising a combination of an analytical technique and the analytical instrument" as recited in claim 31, and as similarly recited in claims 32 and 33.

The above noted deficiencies of Koski and King are not supplied by any of the other references or record, particularly August. Therefore, combining the teachings of August with Koski and King still fails to teach or suggest the features of the present invention, as now more clearly recited in the claims.

August discloses a system and method for providing interactive dialogue and iterative search functions to find information. However, there is no teaching or suggestion in August of an information service providing system or recording medium, as recited in the claims.

The August system and method for information searching includes the determination of a Community of Interest (COI). Search results are further data mined, using at least one of COI and expert preferences to identify important knowledge, formulation and manipulation of results, and summarization of search

results into a document like entity with dynamic attributes described. More specifically, August provides interactive dialogue and iterative search functions to find information on a large network of servers such as the World Wide Web.

One feature of the present invention, as recited in claim 31 and as similarly recited in claims 32 and 33, includes a means for determining whether or not a meta database is to be searched in accordance with information regarding the database to be searched. August does not disclose this feature.

Another feature of the present invention, as recited in claim 31 and as similarly recited in claims 32 and 33, includes a means for searching either the meta database or a case database, for a rule for solving a problem. The meta database is searched if it is determined that the meta database is to be searched, and the case database is searched, if it is determined that the meta database is not to be searched. August does not disclose this feature.

Therefore, August fails to teach or suggest "means for determining whether or not a meta database is to be searched in accordance with the information on the database to be searched" as recited in claim 31, and as similarly recited in claims 32 and 33.

Furthermore, August fails to teach or suggest "means for searching the meta database, if it is determined that the meta database is to be searched, or searching a case database, if it is determined that the meta database is not to be searched, where the meta database and the case database have been provided in a content offer server in advance, for a rule for solving the problem in response to an

instruction input by the demander and in accordance with the information on the database to be searched, the meta database including a plurality of rules extracted from a plurality of actual examples regarding a new solution to solve the problem, each of the rules being a physical or chemical rule having been indexed by both an improving physical or chemical parameter and a deteriorating physical or chemical parameter in advance, each of the examples including an analytical instrument to determine an information on a relationship between the new solution and the problem to be solved, the instruction being related to a combination of a state selection, a part selection and an analysis condition of selection, and a corresponding solution comprising a combination of an analytical technique and the analytical instrument" as recited in claim 31, and as similarly recited in claims 32 and 33.

Koski, King and August each suffer from the same deficiencies relative to the features of the present invention as recited in the claims. Therefore, combining the teachings of Koski, King and August in the manner suggested by the Examiner does not render obvious the features of the present invention as now more clearly recited in claims 31-33. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection of claims 31-33 as being unpatentable over Koski in view of King, further in view of August is respectfully requested.

New Claims 35-43

New claims 35-43 were added so as to more clearly describe features of the present invention. Claims 35-43 are dependent on claims 1, 8, 11, 12, and 30-34,

respectively. Therefore, Applicants submit that claims 35-43 are allowable for at least the reasons previously discussed regarding independent claims 1, 8, 11, 12, and 30-34.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants submit that claims 1-43 are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, early allowance of claims 1-43 is respectfully requested.

To the extent necessary, Applicants petition for an extension of time under 37 CFR 1.136. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, or credit any overpayment of fees, to the deposit account of Mattingly, Stanger, Malur & Brundidge, P.C., Deposit Account No. 50-1417 (referencing attorney docket no. 500.40449X00).

Respectfully submitted,

MATTINGLY, STANGER, MALUR & BRUNDIDGE, P.C.



Donna K. Mason
Registration No. 45,962

DKM/sdb
(703) 684-1120